

R e m a r k s

Applicant submits herewith a Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) by Applicant (2 pages), listing additional references which are or may be material to the examination of the subject application. Copies of the additional references, along with the required fee \$180, are enclosed. It is respectfully requested that they be made of record in the file history of the application.

Identification of references in the IDS is not to be construed as an admission by applicant or attorneys for applicant that such references are available as "prior art" against the subject application. The right is reserved to antedate any listed reference in accordance with standard procedures.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,719,551 issued to Flick (hereinafter "the Flick '551 patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,638,295 issued to Middlebrook et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As a result of applicant's response to the last Office Action, in formulating the current rejection, the Examiner has replaced the earlier cited reference U.S. Patent No. 6,696,927 issued to Flick (hereinafter "the Flick '927 patent") with its ancestor, the Flick '551 patent, of which the Flick '927 patent claims priority. In addition, for the substance of the present Office Action, the Examiner virtually copied the last Office Action, with the old citations to the Flick '927 patent replaced by new citations to the Flick '551 patent.

For the reasons set forth below, like the disclosure of the Flick '927 patent, the disclosure of the Flick '551 patent, notwithstanding the new citations, does not meet the claim limitations identified by the Examiner in the Office Action. Again, applicant takes issue with the Examiner's silence on how he read the claim limitations on the cited references. In effect, the Examiner shifts the burden of examination of the application to applicant, which is improper. All the Examiner did in the Office Action was copy the

representative claim language and allege that it was disclosed somewhere in the Flick '551 and Middlebrook patents, which disclosure is remotely relevant to the claimed invention.

Despite applicant's prior request for a complete explanation of the manner in which the Examiner applied the cited references to the claimed invention, the Examiner has not provided the pertinence of each reference, which is not apparent in this case. Applicant hereby renews the request, and respectfully submits that the Examiner here "must" clearly explain "the pertinence of each reference . . . and each rejected claim specified," in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104(c)(2) (emphasis added).

The invention is directed to a technique for providing, in a vehicle, information from information sources outside the vehicle, e.g., entertainment programs broadcast from radio stations. Illustratively, the radio stations are represented by their respective icons and frequencies on a display in the vehicle. The user may select one of the icons representing the station to which he/she wants to listen. However, the geographic coverage of a radio station may be limited. As the vehicle travels beyond the coverage, the broadcast from the station may become too weak to receive. In accordance with the invention, radio stations are grouped according to geographic areas. The radio stations in each group provide relatively good reception in the geographic area associated with the group. In implementation, representations of the radio stations are stored in a memory of the inventive system according to the geographic areas associated with the radio stations. These geographic areas may be identified by their global positioning system (GPS) coordinates. In operation, the inventive system presents a group of representations of radio stations on a display for selection which are associated with the geographic area which the vehicle is in. The inventive system determines whether the current location of the vehicle is within a predetermined range of a second geographic area. If it is, a second group of representations of radio stations associated with the second geographic area are retrieved from the memory and presented on the display for selection, instead. *See page*

42, line 10 et seq. of the specification, Fig. 18.

The Flick '551 patent discloses a vehicle security system. Applicant carefully reviewed the Flick '551 patent and, in particular, its disclosure at col. 3, lines 5-45 and col. 4, lines 1-32 cited by the Examiner. The Flick '551 patent at best discloses use of an alarm controller to operate alarm indicators, e.g., a siren, responsive to a vehicle security sensor. Despite the Examiner's assertion, nowhere does the Flick '551 patent teach or suggest "providing a set of indicators for indicating a group of information sources outside the vehicle," as claims 21 and 41 recite. Applicant cannot fathom from reading the Flick '551 patent what group of information sources outside the vehicle are indicated by alarm indicators in the Flick '551 patent, where the group of information sources is "associated with a location," as claims 21 and 41 further recite. Nor did the Examiner bother to explain what he regards as such information sources in the Office Action. Moreover, nowhere does the Flick '551 patent teach or suggest "each indicator being selectable to receive signals from the information source indicated by the indicator," as claims 21 and 41 also recite.

Middlebrook discloses a vehicle system for generating turn signals indicating whether a driver is committed to a turn. After carefully reviewing Middlebrook and, in particular, its disclosure at col. 4, lines 13-58 cited by the Examiner, applicant is at a loss as to why a person skilled in the art would have combined a vehicle security system for preventing theft in the Flick '551 patent with a turn signal system for improving safety in making a turn in the Middlebrook patent, as postulated by the Examiner. In any event, even if such a combination of references, and the postulation that alarm indicators are analogous to turn signal indicators are valid, nowhere does Middlebrook teach or suggest "determining whether the vehicle is within a predetermined distance from a second location," and that "a second set of indicators indicating a second group of information sources, which is associated with the second location, [be] provided when it is determined that the vehicle is within the predetermined distance from the second location," as claims

21 and 41 also recite.

For the reasons stated above, claims 21 and 41, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over the cited references. In addition, claim 22 is patentable in its own right as nowhere does the Flick '551 patent teach or suggest that "at least one of the information sources includes a radio station," despite the Examiner's citation of col. 1, lines 44-58.

Similarly, claim 23 is patentable in its own right as nowhere does the Flick '551 patent teach or suggest that "at least one of the information sources includes a television station," despite the Examiner's citation of its abstract. In addition, claims 24-26 are patentable in their own right as nowhere does the Flick '551 patent teach or suggest that "at least one of the indicators when selected is highlighted on the display," despite the Examiner's citation of col. 6, lines 15-32. Further, claim 27 is patentable in its own right as nowhere does the Middlebrook patent teach or suggest determining "whether the vehicle is within the predetermined distance from the second location by comparing a global positioning system (GPS) measurement identifying a current location of the vehicle with a second GPS measurement identifying the second location," despite the Examiner's citation of col. 4, lines 14-67. Moreover, claims 28 and 29 are patentable in their own right as nowhere does the Flick '551 patent teach or suggest that "at least one of the indicators includes an icon," and "the at least one indicator is selectable by pointing and clicking at the icon," despite the Examiner's citation of col. 3, lines 6-42.

Claims 30 and 49 include limitations similar to those of claims 21 and 41 discussed above. For similar reasons, claims 30-49, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over the Flick '551 patent in view of the Middlebrook patent.

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 21-58 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, consideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the


Serial No. 09/838,491

application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

Michael L. Obradovich

By



Alex L. Yip, Attorney

Reg. No. 34,759

212-836-7363

Date: April 20, 2005